



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

vowel-changes, the ordinary word "shortening" being absent, not to speak of such words as "deflection," "obscuration," "heightening," which have now become common words in grammatical vocabulary.

The relative pronoun $\cdot\text{שׁ}$, שׁ is given as a contraction of אֲשֶׁר , a view long since abandoned. The meager statement is made (p. 22) in connection with the pointing of the inseparable prepositions: "the vowel ֿ is frequently used," without any explanation of the fact. The pointing of לִי in לְאִמִּי is simply cited as peculiar, no light of any kind being suggested. This is not practical, for a beginner should be taught principles; nor is it scientific, since it furnishes no explanation.

The chief characteristic of the segholate is said to be "that the absolute state of the plural has the vowels ֿ and ֿ ." Could anything be more absurd? A fine example of logical arrangement is the treatment under one head (pp. 56, 57) of the הִי interrogative, the הִיֿ directive, and the vocative use of the definite article $\cdot\text{הִי}$. The הִי of the Niph'al is said to be omitted in the future, etc., and a Dāghēsh added; the term "assimilation" does not appear to have been known. Likewise, in connection with the פֿ verb (p. 124) it is said: "Whenever this הִי is omitted, a Doghesh is placed in the next letter." The Hōph'al is said to have ֿ , but no explanation of the fact is hinted at.

Most faulty, however, is the treatment accorded the עִי and עִי verbs. Instead of furnishing the pupil at least a modicum of information in the way of assistance, the space (twelve or fifteen lines) is occupied with such misleading statements as this: "The י added (!) in the Hiph. in other verbs is not found in this class" (p. 128). A strange and entirely erroneous distinction is made (p. 132) between פֿ guttural and פֿ verbs by which אָסַף , imperfect יֹאסֵף (also יֹאֲסֵף , יֹאֲסֵף), is treated as פֿ . The pupil is taught that this is the typical פֿ verb, while אָמַר , imperfect יֹאמַר , and the others like it, are special and exceptional. The time ought soon to come when, even in Jewish circles, such grammars would not be called for.

W. R. HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SCHULTHESS' HOMONYME WURZELN IM SYRISCHEN.¹

This is a thoughtful and suggestive contribution toward the elucidation of some difficult questions of Semitic lexicography. Homonymous roots are especially common in such languages as have been compelled to denote more than one original, or current, sound by means of one alphabetic sign. Schulthess thinks that Syriac, because of the state and treatment of its sounds, is the best language to start from in the consideration of Semitic homonyms. The Edessan dialect of the Syriac especially, because of its fixed orthography, its freedom from foreign

¹ HOMONYME WURZELN IM SYRISCHEN. Ein Beitrag zur semitischen Lexicographie. Von Friedrich Schulthess. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1900. xii + 104 pp. M. 4.

admixtures, and the numerous extant manuscripts of extreme antiquity, gives us a correct view of what the ancient Syriac really was.

As it is Schulthess' intention to treat merely of roots which have not been distinguished clearly, or at all, in the dictionaries, there are only forty-nine homonyms discussed in this treatise. As the necessities of the case demand, the illustrations and analogies are mostly from the Arabic. The conditions under which homonyms arise are divided by the author into eight classes. These are those arising from (1) regular consonantal changes, such as ܐ for ܕ and ܕ, ܬ for ܐ and ܓ, and ܡ for ܡ and ܡ; (2) the changes of various sounds to one, such as ܡܢܢ from ܡܢܢ, ܡܢܢ, and ܡܢܢ; (3) intra-Syriac confounding of what were originally different roots, such as ܡܢܢ from ܡܢܢ and ܡܢܢ; (4) metathesis, such as ܡܢܢ into ܡܢܢ (ܡܢܢ); (5) confounding of secondary stems with simple, such as ܡܢܢ from ܡܢܢ with the same form from ܡܢܢ, and ܡܢܢ = ܡܢܢ with the Shaphel of ܡܢܢ; (6) accidental homophony of onomatopoeic roots, such as ܡܢܢ "to tinkle" with ܡܢܢ "to sift;" (7) attraction of one root to another because of like meaning, such as ܡܢܢ = ܡܢܢ and ܡܢܢ [the examples under this rule would simply make (7) a division under rule (1)]; (8) foreign words being adopted and treated as if from genuine Syriac roots, such as ܡܢܢ and ܡܢܢ.

We add the following notes: On p. 17, in the phrase ܡܢܢ, read ܡܢܢ. Compare ܡܢܢ *defluxit*, and ܡܢܢ *hebetavit*, the latter of which is used with ܡܢܢ in an example cited by Payne Smith in his *Thesaurus*. So, perhaps, in Hab. 3:6 ܡܢܢ should be read instead of ܡܢܢ.

On p. 30, may not the ܡܢܢ of Elias of Nisibis be connected with ܡܢܢ "to be ashamed," and the ܡܢܢ of Tat. Act. Mart. with ܡܢܢ "to possess with a devil"? ܡܢܢ ܡܢܢ ܡܢܢ ܡܢܢ would then mean, "Those possessed with devils were divided into troops."

The ܡܢܢ "whirlwind" of p. 44 is probably connected with ܡܢܢ "to go quickly." May not ܡܢܢ, p. 72, be connected with ܡܢܢ "to break"? ܡܢܢ "declivity," p. 79, may possibly be from the same root as ܡܢܢ "the extremity of a desert, or of land." There is little doubt that ܡܢܢ "frech, begehrllich," p. 79, should be compared with the Arab. ܡܢܢ "to be bold." With ܡܢܢ compare ܡܢܢ "the roof of a house which projects." Why not connect ܡܢܢ "dryness, burning air" with ܡܢܢ "to be or become thirsty," ܡܢܢ "thirst, vehemence of heat"?

On the analogy of the Arabic, we cannot see why there cannot be in Syriac three roots of corresponding meanings: فَـ , فَـ , and فَـ . (Compare فَجَّ , فَجَّر , and فَرَج .) فَـ "glänzen" may be compared with فَرَق and فَرَّان "dawn," or by metathesis with فَجَّر . فَـ "barley" may be from a root of the same meaning as فَرَح "to sprout." فَـ "pullet" is apparently the same as the Arab. فَرَج , though فَرَح also means "the young one of a bird." In denying that فَـ means "ergötzen" the author fails to note that فَرَج in Arabic means "to amuse oneself." "Amusing stories" is a very good translation of فَـ .

The Beirut dictionary makes تَـ mean وطى "to trample." If this definition is correct, there is an evident equivalent in مَـ "to oppress, to injure." The مُـ of Deut. 22:8 is a translation of the Hebr. מַדְקָה , which the LXX translated by $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\eta$, in the sense of the Arab. تَاج "breastwork." The author has given enough of examples (on pp. 15, 16, and 35) showing that g and k are frequently interchanged to justify the possible connection of مُـ with تَاج .

R. D. WILSON.

PRINCETON, N. J.

JENSEN'S ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN MYTHS AND EPIC POEMS.¹

It gives us great pleasure to call attention to Professor Jensen's excellent edition of the "Assyrio-Babylonian Myths and Epic Poems" in transliteration, translation, and commentary. The addition of the commentary is a most welcome change of the plan of the editor and the publishers of the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*. After a short preface of great interest to the Assyriologist, in which the author explains his method of work and defines his position toward his predecessors, he gives in twelve sections all the Babylonian myths and epic poems thus far known, viz.: the creation-account (pp. 2-43); the story of Bēl and LAB-bu² (pp. 44-7); of Zū, the storm-bird (pp. 47-57); the I(U)ra (or Dibbara)-myth (pp. 57-73); the legend of Nergal and Ereškigal³

¹ ASSYRISCH-BABYLONISCHE MYTHEN UND EPEN. Von P. Jensen. 1. Hälfte (= *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*. In Verbindung mit L. Abel, C. Bezold, P. Jensen, F. E. Peiser, H. Winckler herausgegeben von Eberhard Schrader. VI. Band: "Mythologische, religiöse und verwandte Texte." 1. Teil.) Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1900. xx+320 pp. M. 13.

² Read lab-bu by the author and explained as "lion." Others read kal-bu "dog," and again others, especially Zimmern, rib-bu = Hebr. רִיב . See labbu, 1, in *Concise Dictionary*, p. 466, col. 2.

³ So read also in IV, 31 a 24 (the descent of Ištar), instead of Nin-ki-gal. See Jensen, p. 82, rm. 1.